

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
Thursday, November 15 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. RANA

(Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750,
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.37
21 November 1990
ENGLISH

90-63226 3104V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, in cluster 4, and on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, in cluster 9. Subsequently, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, A/C.1/45/L.42 and A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1, in cluster 13.

In addition, it is my understanding that this morning the Committee is in a position to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 in cluster 12. Draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C.1/45/L.35, in cluster 5, and draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B, in cluster 7 have been postponed to allow for more consultation among delegations. We may be in a position to take action on them at our next meeting.

I have just been informed by the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.11 that, following consultations with concerned delegations, the sponsor will not now press that draft resolution to a vote. In the light of this information the Committee will not take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.11 and the subsequent amendment to that draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.57.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that Panama has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.42; and Costa Rica and Panama have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: As no delegation wishes to introduce a draft resolution, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, in cluster 4. I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their position on the draft resolution.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation has asked to speak in order to draw attention to a technical misunderstanding that took place when the votes on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", were recorded. We discovered to our amazement and regret that the position of our delegation was not reflected on the voting display. We wish to confirm that our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.17.

The CHAIRMAN: The position of the Soviet Union will be duly reflected in the record.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): In the light of recent discussions, allow me to make some brief comments on the content of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities", which was introduced by the representative of Hungary and which is also co-sponsored, inter alia, by my delegation.

Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution states that the General Assembly

"Recognizes that an armed attack or a threat of armed attack on a safeguarded nuclear facility, operational or under construction, would create a situation in which the Security Council would have to act immediately in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including measures under Chapter VII".

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

I might add that this language comes from the consensus language of the 1985 Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the non-proliferation Treaty.

In this regard I want to emphasize my delegation's understanding that an armed attack on any kind of nuclear facility, be it safeguarded or not, constitutes not only a major threat to and breach of international security and peace but is certainly a deplorable and reprehensible method of warfare. However, we must bear in mind that the international community, through the conclusion and implementation of the non-proliferation Treaty, has set certain standards of quality for nuclear facilities. These standards of quality constitute precisely the safeguards which, in the light of the provisions of article 3 of the non-proliferation Treaty, apply to the nuclear facilities of those States that are parties to that Treaty. My delegation is of the opinion that this qualitative difference between nuclear facilities under safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and facilities without those safeguards has a certain significance. That is why we support the formulation contained in the aforesaid draft resolution and we hope that an overwhelming majority of member States will find themselves in a position to vote in favour of the text. At the same time, we call on those countries that have not placed their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards to do so in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Pakistan, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I should like to explain Pakistan's position on the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities", contained in document A/C.1/45/L.38.

It is generally recognized that an armed attack on a nuclear facility or installation would result in radioactive releases with grave consequences within and beyond the boundaries of the State which has been attacked. Such an attack would cause not only severe damage to the environment, but also incalculable loss of human life.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 duly recognizes that fact in its preambular paragraphs. Unfortunately, in its operative paragraphs it somehow inserts an irrelevant distinction between safeguarded and unsafeguarded facilities. From the point of view of the consequential danger from radioactivity, there is no difference in the results and that categorization is thus unnecessary.

Similarly, an attack or the threat of an attack on a nuclear facility would endanger international peace and security irrespective of whether the nuclear facility in question was safeguarded or unsafeguarded. In such an eventuality, the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, would be required to act immediately in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. While we fully support the idea of the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities, we are disappointed that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/45/L.38 tries to create an unrealistic and ill-founded distinction between the effects of attacks on safeguarded and the effects of attacks on unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. We are of the considered view that that distinction is based on invalid assumptions.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

In view of the foregoing, we should have preferred it if the sponsors had agreed to our proposal to delete the word "safeguarded" from operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. In view of the inability of the sponsors to agree to our proposal, my delegation will be constrained to request separate votes on paragraphs 1 and 2, in which we intend to vote against those paragraphs. We intend to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole, and shall do so with a heavy heart.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "General and complete disarmament: Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Germany, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Netherlands, Sweden and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: France, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, India, Israel, Mexico, Namibia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 was retained by 115 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: Pakistan, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, France, India, Israel, Mexico, Namibia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 was retained by 115 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Israel

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 was adopted by 126 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, France, India, Namibia, Pakistan, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, as a whole, was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain the position of Peru in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities", which the Committee has just adopted.

My delegation, overcoming major difficulties posed by the text, and in strict accordance with the principles that guide our foreign policy on disarmament, voted in favour of the draft resolution, in particular operative paragraphs 1 and 2.

Armed attacks on nuclear facilities, as well as being unacceptable acts of

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

violence, can have serious consequences for individuals and for the environment because of the harmful effects of the atomic radiation that they can cause.

In this respect Peru firmly supports all initiatives submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, the General Conference of the Organization of American States and other forums and designed to bring about the prohibition and prevention of such attacks. My country firmly supports the holding of a diplomatic conference to give thorough consideration to all aspects of this question, in particular, those relating to the protection of civilians and the environment in the case of attacks on nuclear facilities.

This is why my delegation is extremely concerned that operative paragraphs 1 and 2 are confined to action by the international community in respect of cases in which attacks are perpetrated on nuclear facilities that are under the safeguards system. This restriction, far from helping to build an international consensus on the subject, causes a dangerous vacuum, because it leaves out the potential harmful effects of attacks on nuclear installations that are not under the safeguards system.

We hope that, next year, the sponsors of the draft resolution on this subject will take into account the comments that have been made by my delegation.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 because we are in full agreement with its thrust. However, we would have preferred operative paragraph 1 to be worded differently. The Government of Israel has on many occasions officially declared that its policy is that nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful ends should be inviolable and that it will not attack or threaten to attack any peaceful nuclear facilities.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities". The United Kingdom's policy is to maintain negotiations on this subject in the Conference on Disarmament. In our view, operative paragraphs 1 and 4 are inconsistent with that approach.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation takes this opportunity to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, which has just been adopted.

The Cuban delegation voted in favour of the text as a whole because we believe that attacks on nuclear facilities must be prohibited. This matter has been considered in the multilateral negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament, in which body my country has worked consistently, and will continue to work, for a ban on attacks on nuclear facilities. But we must be frank and make it clear that our vote in favour of this draft resolution does not in any way mean that we do not have differences with regard to some of the ideas contained in the text.

First, we deeply regret the way in which the text was, so to speak, negotiated. We also regret the fact that the main sponsors did not allow for the kind of negotiations that would have made it possible to avoid the resultant text, bearing in mind the various issues contained therein.

My delegation feels that there are certain inconsistencies. In some places there is reference to safeguarded nuclear facilities, whereas in other places there is reference simply to nuclear facilities. For the purposes of the work that we are doing, and with a view to achieving our objectives, it would have been much better to refer to nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes. We believe that this would have enabled us to avoid the problems that are reflected in the results of the voting.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

Furthermore, operative paragraph 2 calls upon all States "to abide by any decisions taken by the Security Council". In the view of my delegation this is a vague way to make an appeal to States in connection with decisions of the Security Council; it does not specify the decisions that are at issue and this could lead to different interpretations. We would have preferred either to eliminate the confusing reference in paragraph 2 to decisions of the Security Council, especially as paragraph 1 already contains the idea, or to refer to clearly defined decisions of the Security Council. The reference to "any decisions" is too vague.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

We are talking about the maintenance of international peace and security, and Member States must be clear about which decisions by the Security Council are involved; it is not a question of abiding by "any decisions".

In respect of operative paragraph 4, my delegation has no formal objection to Member States considering the possibility of the diplomatic conference mentioned here: we believe that this might be another way to try to protect or expand the protection of nuclear facilities, but that this does not mean that we should not continue the work within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament that we have been doing despite a number of difficulties. For this reason, we would have preferred to see, in operative paragraph 3, a much clearer reference to the Conference on Disarmament, to the effect that it should step up its work, and an appeal to the participants in that Conference to exert all possible efforts.

This brings me to something that is striking in its absence from the draft resolution, and that is - if we are really talking about prohibiting or preventing attacks on nuclear facilities - a paragraph that condemns or rejects such attacks on nuclear facilities. In our delegation's view, the lack of such a paragraph in this draft resolution is a serious omission.

To sum up, Cuba's general objective has been to improve this text. We would urge that next year, when we are called upon to consider a similar text, we should have broader consultations and the opinions of other countries should be taken into account.

Mrs. MANTILLA (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to give a brief explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38. Ecuador voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, and in favour of operative paragraph 4 specifically; however, we abstained when operative paragraphs 1 and 2 were put to the vote because we believe that all nuclear

(Mrs. Mantilla, Ecuador)

facilities should be covered by the obligation not to use force, in other words, by the obligation not to attack them.

Ecuador believes that the obligations contained in the instruments that refer to the need to submit all such facilities to United Nations safeguards mechanisms should be complied with. Furthermore, Ecuador considers it essential to avoid any type of assertion that might be interpreted as encouraging the Security Council to act in certain cases, or placing conditions on such action. The Charter of the United Nations states specifically the circumstances in which the Security Council can and should act and gives it the necessary authority to take decisions to that end.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain the reasons for its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38.

The Soviet Union is a convinced supporter of the view that practical measures to prohibit attacks on nuclear facilities should be worked out as soon as possible.

I should like to take this opportunity to recall that since 1982 we have on more than one occasion put forward specific proposals on this issue for consideration both by the General Assembly and by the Conference on Disarmament. The Soviet Union has ratified Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, which prohibits attacks on nuclear power stations, and considers that the international legal régime protecting nuclear facilities needs further strengthening.

During the consideration of this issue in the Geneva Conference's Ad hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons, the Soviet Union has adopted a flexible position aimed at seeking mutually acceptable decisions on all the problems involved. Thus, while preferring that the issue of prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities be

(Mr. Agayev, USSR)

considered separately from that of banning radiological weapons in the traditional sense, we have stated that we are prepared for these issues to be settled within the framework of a single agreement. The drafting of two separate conventions on these issues by the Conference on Disarmament would also be acceptable to us, on the understanding that they must enter into force at the same time.

As for the category of nuclear facilities which should be protected from attack, the Soviet Union has specifically expressed its agreement to having protection both for peaceful and for military nuclear facilities, with the exception of those facilities associated with weapons systems.

We are ready to examine constructively all possible variants for a solution to the problem of preventing attacks on nuclear facilities, in the interest of seeking a compromise outcome. In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, just adopted, is, on the whole, a proper response to the need to step up multilateral consideration of the issue of prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities, and takes fresh approaches into account. The Soviet delegation therefore voted in favour of it.

Mr. CHADHA (India): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, entitled "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities".

It is an undisputed fact that an armed attack on any nuclear installation, safeguarded or not, could result in radioactive releases with grave consequences within and beyond the boundaries of the State which has been attacked. Consequently, there is a need to improve the present régime with regard to the protection of all nuclear facilities. Resolution GC(XXXI)/RES/475, adopted by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency on 28 September 1987, which is quoted in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, also mentions the need to protect all nuclear installations in this context.

(Mr. Chadha, India)

Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution we have just adopted, however, mention safeguarded facilities only, thus eliminating from the resolution's purview other nuclear installations and, in an indirect manner, condoning attacks on other nuclear installations. My delegation therefore abstained from voting on these paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38, concerning the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities.

My delegation abstained from voting on this draft resolution as a whole and voted against operative paragraphs 1 and 4, for the following reasons. First, France does not share the view of the sponsors of the draft resolution that the threat of an armed attack against a nuclear facility should automatically entail an obligation for the Security Council to act. Secondly, France considers that the Conference on Disarmament is not the proper forum for dealing with the issue of attacks on nuclear facilities, which is an issue of humanitarian law in armed conflicts - a fact recognized, indeed, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The deadlock on this matter - which has lasted years now - at the Conference on Disarmament justifies, a posteriori, France's non-participation in its work. Thirdly, turning to the Protocol of 1977 additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, France did not subscribe to all the provisions of the Protocol for reasons relating to France's security policy, but has no objection to a diplomatic conference with a view to strengthening the existing régime.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.38 as a whole and on operative paragraphs 1 and 2. With regard to our abstention on paragraph 1, we do not agree with its content, inasmuch as it departs from the criterion of mass destruction which should be observed in dealing with the subject.

Moreover, in our opinion, it contains serious gaps from a technical standpoint, since there are certain installations which, in accordance with the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), do not need safeguards and which we feel should be protected, since their destruction, if they were to be attacked, could result in radioactive dissemination and have effects similar to those weapons of mass destruction.

We believe that this type of selective draft resolution does not constitute the best way of dealing with the subject of the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities, and that such selective draft resolutions in fact are directed at other collateral objectives.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, in cluster 9.

Mr. CHADHA (India): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", covers a theme which should be of universal concern since it pertains to the qualitative improvement of weapons and weapons systems, their impact on the global security environment and the need to channel scientific and technological developments for peaceful needs and the benefit of mankind. The considerations behind the draft resolution were spelled out by my delegation while introducing the draft resolution earlier in the current session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Chadha, India)

The draft resolutions on the subject received wide support during the last two sessions of the General Assembly, and it is our hope that that support will be further increased when the draft resolution is voted upon today, so as to express the universality of the concern in the Committee on this important issue.

It has certainly been the objective of our delegation to hold extensive consultations towards this end, and draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 represents the results of that effort. We thank the delegations which have co-operated with us.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security". Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24 was introduced by the representative of India at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

There is an oral statement in connection with the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 are the following: Afghanistan, Bolivia, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Peru, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

I have to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution.

By the terms of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to follow scientific and technological developments in order to make an assessment of emerging "new

(Mr. Kheradi)

technologies" and submit to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session a framework for technology assessment guided, inter alia, by the criteria suggested in his report.

In carrying out this task, the Secretary-General would take such actions as practicable within the existing resources of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, and therefore there would be no additional programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mrs. MIEDEMA (Netherlands): The Netherlands, regrettably, could not support draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 on scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security. Although the draft resolution has been improved, it still does not have, in our view, the right conceptual point of departure. We accept the sincere motivation of the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, but we believe that the most appropriate way of dealing with these concerns would have been to incorporate them in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1. However, this did not happen, so now we have to address draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 on its own merits.

The pursuit of scientific and technological development is in itself, in our view, an abstract - that is, an unqualifiable - process. It is the application of scientific and technological research that may have a beneficial, a neutral or a negative effect. This holds true, also, for military applications, which may hamper disarmament efforts but are equally likely to enhance and strengthen international security.

(Mrs. Miedema, Netherlands)

To mention one example, scientific and technological developments as applied, for instance, to satellites could further transparency as well as better knowledge of military capabilities. In the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, the Assembly would stress the possible negative impact of scientific and technological developments on the security environment and on the process of arms limitation and disarmament. The Netherlands, however, holds the view that modern military technology, if properly used, may very well serve stability and enhance security.

These reasons prompted us to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): Now that we have completed action on the two draft resolutions on the subject of science and technology in relation to disarmament - cluster 9 - I should like to explain why it was that, while the United Kingdom was able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, it felt obliged to vote against A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

In giving approval for future consideration of issues, including the commitment of resources, it is essential that the work involved is clearly defined, realistic and directly in support of the objectives of the First Committee. It is the United Kingdom's view that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 meets these criteria. This draft resolution is focused on the positive contribution that science and technology could make to arms control and disarmament, in particular in the field of verification of compliance with agreements and treaties.

In draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1 the Secretary-General is asked to undertake a wide-ranging task in assessing the whole field of emerging technologies in relation to the disarmament process in general. In our view, to undertake such a task effectively would demand a great deal of resources.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

We welcome the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security" (A/45/568). We must be selective in considering how to follow up the conclusions of that report.

We consider that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1 represents the most practical and cost-effective step forward.

Mr. JANDL (Austria): Austria voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security". As in previous years, we have supported the draft resolution on this subject because we are in agreement with the basic thrust of the text. At the same time, we are quite aware of the dual applicability of technological advancements. Although they are a priori neutral in their essence, they can entail negative effects for peace and security if applied with hostile intent. The potential to create new weapons systems or refine existing ones and make them more sophisticated can contribute to decreasing stability and, in certain circumstances, increase the probability of conflicts.

On the other hand, my delegation wants to emphasize that science and technology can also have very positive effects on peace and security, in particular in the field of the implementation and verification of disarmament agreements, as well as in connection with the task of weapons disposal. These aspects are appropriately reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.13/Rev.1, of which my delegation has the honour to be a sponsor and which was adopted by the Committee unanimously.

I should like to add that the fact that scientific and technological advancements can have both negative and positive effects on international security was also elaborated on at the Sendai seminar earlier this year, which is mentioned in the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1. In this

(Mr. Jandl, Austria)

context, let me quote from the statement of Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi at the Sendai meeting:

"I hope that we shall be better able to identify the scientific and technological developments that offer the greatest prospects for building mutual confidence and understanding, for preventing accidents and unwanted escalation and for assisting in the verification of international agreements. I also hope that we are able to gain a clearer perspective on developments which may pose the greatest risk of exacerbating vulnerability, arms races or instabilities that complicate efforts to negotiate lower levels of force."

Bearing in mind the negative as well as the positive applications of scientific and technological developments in the military and related fields and hence their positive and negative impacts on international security, and in the hope that the sponsors might take up this dual aspect next year, Austria voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I have asked to speak to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.24/Rev.1, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

My delegation abstained on this draft resolution primarily because it continues to contain elements that we cannot fully support. We would have preferred to be able to vote in favour of it, particularly since it is evident that the draft resolution's sponsors made very considerable efforts to recognize the complexity of the issues involved in this area, the diversity of views and the need for closer co-operation among States to assess how best to deal with these.

We note that there had been some discussion this year of the possibility of merging this draft resolution with the parallel draft resolution, of which we are a sponsor, on "Science and technology for disarmament". We regret that in the event

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

this did not prove possible. We hope that this apparent inclination to seek a comprehensive expression of the international community's diverse concerns in this area will become, through further consultations and exchanges, a clear trend and that in the near future we shall be able to support a single draft resolution on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, in cluster 12.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation wishes to make a short statement in connection with the draft resolution that will be acted upon today and in that context to say a few words on another draft resolution that was put to the vote at our last meeting. Originally they were both scheduled for action yesterday.

(Mr. Gajda, Hungary)

It is with great regret that the Hungarian delegation notes the unfortunate fact that the report of the Conference on Disarmament has again this year become the subject of sharp exchanges.

As long as the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament matters operates, and most pertinently so, on the basis of consensus, and its yearly report to the General Assembly is drafted and adopted in the same manner, that report in our considered view should be the subject of a non-controversial, in essence procedural, draft resolution.

This, however, has not been the case for some time and is not the case at the present session either. The wording of the draft resolution before our Committee (A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1) simply precludes its adoption without a great number of dissenting votes, including the votes of numerous members of the Conference on Disarmament as well.

Hungary, a member of the Conference on Disarmament, is always eager and ready to contribute its share to progress in negotiations on real problems. It is also ready to engage in debate on matters of real substance where the common goal is to achieve agreement on important issues. We are not, however, willing to get locked into never-ending, self-generating polemics which cannot take us anywhere and which in the end can become even counter-productive to negotiations. We simply cannot be part of such exercises.

It was with that consideration in mind that the Hungarian delegation was unable to support the draft resolution on a comprehensive programme of disarmament contained in document A/C.1/45/L.32, which was voted upon at the previous meeting.

At a time when the future of the Conference on Disarmament - and, in fact, the multilateral disarmament negotiating process as a whole - is the subject of

(Mr. Gajda, Hungary)

agonizing debate, not to mention many chastising criticisms, it is simply unrealistic to try to force upon the Conference on Disarmament topics that have long proved unproductive.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, which is now before the Committee, reflects similar designs, disregarding facts of life and previous conclusions. It is therefore with great regret that the Hungarian delegation finds itself obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 are Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". This draft resolution was introduced by Yugoslavia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1990.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 108 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their vote after the voting.

* Subsequently the delegation of Zaire advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". We support its critical tone. At the same time the draft could, in our view, have more fully reflected the real state of affairs at the Conference, including the positive aspects connected to the process of rationalization of the work of that forum which has begun.

It is true that we cannot reconcile ourselves to the fact that the negotiation process at the Conference is clearly lagging behind the dynamism of world developments and is proceeding at a pace characteristic of the post-war period. The first steps to enhance the effectiveness of the Conference's work undertaken during its summer session, although still clearly insufficient, nevertheless are in the right direction. The most important thing is that at the Conference a purposeful collective search has begun in today's rapidly changing world. As we see it here, we cannot bank on simple decisions, and in drawing them up it will be necessary to take into account a great number of factors, including the real progress made in discussion of one or another issue at the Conference. The Soviet Union firmly favours having the Conference in fact reaffirming its capability to go from an exchange of views to drawing up responsible decisions on matters on its agenda. In our view the Conference's primary objective is still the speediest conclusion of negotiations to draw up a convention on a full and effective ban on producing, acquiring and storing all forms of chemical weapons and their destruction. We sincerely hope that in 1991 the last remaining obstacles to agreement on a convention on chemical weapons will be overcome.

In the Conference's work, we must concentrate our efforts on such priority areas as the cessation of nuclear tests. It is high time to begin multilateral negotiations on drawing up an agreement on a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. A

(Mr. Agayev, USSR)

substantive intensification of work is also needed for consideration of issues connected with preventing an arms race in outer space. It is important, finally, more fully to highlight possible practical measures in other areas as well. We welcome the efforts being undertaken to enhance the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament, in the framework of the present session of the General Assembly, including consultations which are being held by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, Ambassador Donowaki. I should like to express the hope that these efforts will in the last analysis lead to having appropriate resolutions on the report of the Conference receive general support by delegations at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Agayev, USSR)

We are sincerely convinced that the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, will in the near future be able to demonstrate its important role in negotiations on disarmament issues of truly high priority. For our part, we are ready to promote the implementation of the objectives before us.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): "Consensus" is the key word applicable to the Conference on Disarmament. In that single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum views are expressed across the whole spectrum of political articulation. How could the work of that forum be done otherwise than by consensus? Would it not therefore be preferable for the report of the Conference on Disarmament, containing rather diverging views on all sorts of political issues, to be presented to the General Assembly by all States members of the Conference on Disarmament together? In our view, the consensus reached in the Conference on its annual report should have its echo in the General Assembly, in the same way as the General Assembly deals with the report of the Disarmament Commission, that is, by adoption of a consensus resolution.

The General Assembly addresses all items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament by means of specific resolutions pertaining to the subject-matter of the respective items. There is no good reason to deal with the same issues again in the resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, a resolution which should be of a general and non-controversial nature.

As is known, the Netherlands delegation has been exerting its best efforts in the last few years to arrive at the adoption of a draft resolution under agenda item 60 (b) along the lines I have just mentioned, with a view to enabling the General Assembly to endorse the report of the Conference on Disarmament without a vote - but to no avail. Again, the First Committee has been called upon to take

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

action on a clearly controversial draft. To what end? Is the General Assembly supposed to resolve the political difficulties that manifest themselves between delegations of the Conference on Disarmament as well as the ensuing differences in approach to the organization of work in that body? The fear seems warranted that the effect of the language used in document A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1 might be rather counter-productive.

The Netherlands delegation regrets that the General Assembly will once again be unable to adopt a widely sponsored draft resolution without a vote. We should have preferred the matter of substance under consideration to have been dealt with in a procedural way, in conformity with the high status of the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, I should like to associate the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with the explanation of vote given by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): Although Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26/Rev.1, we must express our regret that this year yet again it has not been possible for the sponsors of the text to produce a resolution capable of enjoying consensus support.

The Conference on Disarmament works by consensus, and its annual report is adopted by consensus. It follows that in the First Committee draft resolutions on the Conference should also be susceptible to consensus. We are aware of and appreciate the efforts to negotiate a single text, but Australia hopes that next year a greater and even more concerted attempt can be made to produce a text capable of support by all members of the Committee.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

On the substance of the text, we note that in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.26 the General Assembly would urge the Conference on Disarmament to provide negotiating mandates to ad hoc committees on all of its agenda items. Australia would not object to the establishment of ad hoc committees with negotiating mandates on any item on the agenda of the Conference if consensus to do so existed. However, we also note that the Conference on Disarmament has various alternative methods at its disposal which may occasionally be more appropriate, especially when these might be the only way to advance the work of the Conference.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): On behalf of the United States of America I, too, should like to associate myself fully with the comments made by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the following draft resolutions in cluster 13: draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, A/C.1/45/L.42 and A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1.

As no delegations wish to explain their vote before the voting, the Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space: confidence-building measures in outer space". This draft resolution has programme budget implications, as set out in document A/C.1/45/L.59.

Before proceeding to the vote I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1 are: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Peru, Sweden, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution

A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will not proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42, entitled "Verification in all its aspects: study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 28th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1990. An oral statement will be made with regard to it.

I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of co-sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42 are as follows: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

I should also like to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.42, entitled "Verification in all its aspects: study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

"By the terms of operative paragraph 5, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to take appropriate action within available resources on the recommendations of the Group and, by operative paragraph 7, would request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session on actions taken by Member States and by the United Nations Secretariat to implement these recommendations.

"In carrying out these tasks, the Secretary-General would take such actions as are practicable within the existing resources of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, supplemented by any relevant voluntary resources that may be received to implement the recommendations of the Group. There would therefore be no additional programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991."

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42 be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1 entitled "General and complete disarmament: defensive security concepts and policies". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 27th meeting of the First Committee on 6 November 1990. The draft resolution has programme budget implications, contained in document A/C.1/45/L.61.

Before proceeding to the vote, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1 are as follows: Australia, Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: France, Israel, Japan, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1 was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 13.

Mr. GALVAO (Brazil): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.50/Rev.1, because we agreed with the main thrust and objective of this text. Nevertheless, we believe that some of the elements in the draft resolution are not well defined. Certain terms referred to are not generally in use or are employed in a context in which they might be ambiguous. This is particularly true of the pairing of the words "security" and "stability" when it would certainly have been better to use the term "peace and security".

We hope that the study to be undertaken by the Secretary-General will contribute to making the interesting and positive idea of defensive security concepts and policies conceptually clear and better defined.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, entitled "Confidence-building measures in outer space", does not imply opposition either to the principle of confidence-building measures in outer space or to the idea of a study per se. We would have preferred, as a more economical step, for the draft resolution to state that the General Assembly invites Member States to present their views on the subject to the Secretary-General. Such views could have included the different technologies available for such confidence-building measures and mechanisms for international co-operation. Members could then have reviewed the compilation of views made by the Secretary-General to determine what steps should follow. We would certainly have joined the consensus had there been a draft resolution along those lines.

Mr. AGAYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1, entitled "Confidence-building measures in outer space". We share the view that in any expansion of the use of outer space there is a need for greater transparency and for a strengthening of confidence-building measures. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space of the Conference on Disarmament has been carrying out a great deal of work to highlight areas in which such measures could be adopted and we have a positive opinion of the results of that work. In that connection the Soviet delegation wishes to emphasize that in supporting the idea - to be found in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.22/Rev.1 - of carrying out a study concerning such confidence-building measures in outer space. The Soviet delegation believes that such a study will not replace or duplicate the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space of the Conference on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We have thus concluded the consideration of and action on the draft resolutions prescribed for this morning.

At the next meeting of the First Committee, which will take place tomorrow morning, we shall take up all of the remaining draft resolutions, namely: in cluster 5, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C.1/45/L.35; in cluster 7, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1; in cluster 11, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, A/C.1/45/L.31 and A/C.1/45/L.41; in cluster 12, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12; and in cluster 13, draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.10, A/C.1/45/L.49 and A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
38th meeting
held on
Friday, 16 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. RANA

(Nepal)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions on all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750,
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.38
23 November 1990
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 66 AND 155 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will first take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and L.35, in cluster 5, and draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and L.45/Rev.1, in cluster 7. Subsequently, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.30, L.31 and L.41, in cluster 11. Then the Committee will take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1, in cluster 12. After taking action on those draft resolutions, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions listed in cluster 13: A/C.1/45/L.10, L.49 and L.53/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have to inform the Committee that Panama has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5.

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to take action on the draft resolutions I have mentioned, I shall call upon delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The agenda item "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions" has been the subject of more General Assembly resolutions than any other, with the unfortunate exception of the question of apartheid. It is an item the international community defined and to which it gave high priority more than three decades ago. Stubborn resistance by some has prevented the cessation of test explosions, which would be of fundamental importance in stopping the nuclear-arms race. The vast majority of States must continue in the General Assembly and at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament to advocate the speedy adoption of such a measure and to explore other avenues for multilateral co-operation, such as the amendment procedures provided for in the

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

1963 partial test-ban Treaty. We must continue to struggle with the same enthusiasm as was shown more than a century ago by abolitionists the world over in the fight against slavery.

With regard to agenda item 46, "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions", I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, which is sponsored by the delegations of Afghanistan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Myanmar, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico. The text of the draft resolution is basically the same as that of last year's resolution 44/105. In the preambular part reference is made to the priority assigned to this question, which the General Assembly has been considering for more than 30 years and on which it has adopted more than 70 resolutions. In this connection, I have to amend the second preambular paragraph to read "seventy" rather than "fifty".

In the preamble, also, the undertakings under the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water are referred to and a 1984 statement by the Secretary-General, the 1988 affirmation by the leaders of the Six-Nation Initiative, and the document adopted by the 1989 non-aligned summit are recalled.

In the penultimate preambular paragraph note is taken with satisfaction of the progress made in the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on seismic events; and in the final preambular paragraph the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban by the Conference on Disarmament at its summer session in 1990 is noted.

In the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30, the General Assembly would reiterate

"its grave concern that nuclear testing continues unabated, against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of Member States"

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

and would reaffirm

"its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear test explosions by all States for all time is a matter of the highest priority;"

and that

"such a treaty would constitute a contribution of the utmost importance to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race."

In paragraph 4 the Assembly would urge

"once more all nuclear-weapon States, in particular the three depositary States of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to seek to achieve the early discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time and to expedite negotiations to this end".

This means to negotiate a treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, and in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft resolution the modalities for such negotiations are set out.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

The sponsors hope that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.30 will gain strong support from the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations. The text was distributed on 31 October, more than a fortnight ago, but even before that we had entered into consultations with the delegations of Australia and New Zealand, the main sponsors of the other draft resolution on this subject, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41. Yesterday we believed that we had reached agreement on a single text, and we wish to express our appreciation to those two delegations, and in particular Mr. Morris of Australia, as well as to the other delegations that traditionally sponsor the other draft resolution on this item. This year's draft resolution will also enjoy Mexico's full support.

I said that we believed we had reached agreement on a single text. However, only a few hours ago we were told that a small group of countries had rejected what a large number of countries had negotiated and agreed upon. We regret this, inter alia because such an attitude runs counter to the spirit that should guide the work and consultations of the Committee.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". The draft resolution has the following sponsors: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Thailand, Vanuatu and Zaire.

The draft resolution on this subject, of which Australia and New Zealand alternate as principal sponsor, claims the broad support of the international community. Indeed, last year it was supported by the overwhelming majority of Member States, with only two negative votes and six abstentions. The sponsors trust that it will again receive such support.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

The central purpose of the draft resolution is to encourage and direct the work on a comprehensive test ban in the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, where the test-ban question is the first item on the agenda. This year the Conference re-established late in its session an Ad Hoc Committee to focus on specific and interrelated test-ban issues, including structure and scope as well as verification and compliance. Time did not allow, however, such a focused consideration to move very far. In operative paragraph 2, therefore, the General Assembly would call on the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish its Ad Hoc Committee at the beginning of its 1991 session in order to carry forward this work.

The detailed work of the Group of Seismic Experts, which, on the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, will make an essential contribution to the verification of such a treaty, is outlined and encouraged in paragraph 3. This, along with the work outlined in paragraph 2 referred to above, constitutes the most practical and feasible route to the multilateral preparation for a test ban currently available.

A few new elements appear in the draft resolution this year. In response to a wide range of concerns based on threats and potential threats to the environment from nuclear testing, we have included reference to such concerns. We also refer, naturally, to developments which have taken place during the year, including: the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee in the Conference on Disarmament; the agreement on a Treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions and a partial test-ban Treaty by the United States and the Soviet Union; progress in the sphere of nuclear disarmament; and the call by a large number of States parties to the 1963 Moscow Treaty - the partial test-ban Treaty - for an amendment conference to convert that Treaty into a comprehensive test ban.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

We consider that with these additions we again have a text which is representative of the views of the vast majority of Member States, and we strongly commend it to all for their positive support.

Having introduced draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.41, I should like to say a few words about the question of a single text on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Member States will be aware that there are currently two draft resolutions on this subject before the First Committee. Australia, as a staunch supporter of a comprehensive test ban, supports both. Member States may be aware also that for the past four weeks an extensive and intensive series of negotiations has taken place between the authors of both texts with a view to reaching a single text that would command the overwhelming support of the international community. At this point I should like to pay a tribute to Ambassador Marin Bosch for the way in which he conducted the negotiations from his side.

The process was embarked upon by all involved in good faith, and creative new approaches were found. At one point it appeared that we might indeed have found a compromise text. That, unfortunately, proved not to be the case. A few States had difficulties with the concepts involved in the suggested text, and had we pursued that path we might have given the world the impression that the international demand for a test ban was waning. We are convinced that this is not the case. Australia hopes, nevertheless, that what was achieved will not be lost and that at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly we shall achieve the single text that eluded us at this session.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom welcomes the adoption yesterday by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.42, on verification in all its aspects. In the draft resolution the report of the Secretary-General on the

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

subject is commended. In supporting that commendation, the United Kingdom would like to draw particular attention to an important section of the report, section II G, which deals with verification measures and the need for treaty specificity. We much welcome the emphasis in this section of the report on treaty specificity. We find it difficult to envisage a single international system of verification which would cover a range of different multilateral agreements. Our experience of negotiation and implementation of arms-control and disarmament agreements demonstrates that, while there are some general principles that can be applied to verification measures, such measures and their method of implementation can vary significantly depending on the nature of the agreement.

It is essential that the method of implementation of verification provisions give the necessary degree of confidence in compliance for all parties to any particular agreement. This will mean that in many cases verification will be the responsibility of the States parties to an agreement and of the secretariat for that agreement. The forthcoming chemical weapons convention is a case in point.

I turn now to a draft resolution on which action will be taken today. I should like to introduce, on behalf of its sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

The sponsors of the draft resolution are Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The sponsors feel that one of the most important factors in the current world situation is the increase in understanding and co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union. International security is increased and our disarmament objectives are brought nearer to attainment when those two Powers are able to agree to substantive arms reductions, particularly nuclear arms reductions, and to other means of enhancing strategic stability.

We believe that any resolution on the question of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union should be designed to welcome the achievements in that process to date and to encourage further progress. Clearly, such encouragement can be effective only if both the United States and the Soviet Union feel able to support the resolution itself. If, on the other hand, they feel that the resolution presses them too hard and, particularly, if it presses them to change the direction of their endeavours in ways unacceptable to them, it would not be productive.

It is also our opinion that, given the importance of the bilateral nuclear arms negotiations to us all, the Committee's objective should be a single draft resolution adopted by consensus. The text of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 embodies the approach I have just described. It notes the important statements of the two Presidents of 1 June 1990, welcomes the prospect of a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms (START) in the near future and the agreement to pursue new negotiations on nuclear and space arms following the signature of the START treaty. It calls on the two Governments to spare no effort in seeking the agreed objectives of the negotiations.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

We recognize that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 have other concerns which they feel it proper to put to the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the bilateral negotiations. We therefore felt it important to attempt a merger of our draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 with draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5, sponsored by Yugoslavia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We appreciated that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 was much closer to our ideas than its predecessors at the forty-third and forty-fourth sessions of the General Assembly and this gave us considerable encouragement. We are grateful to the sponsors of that draft resolution for the careful consideration which they gave to our proposals and their co-operative spirit. We particularly thank the delegation of Yugoslavia for its efforts.

Unfortunately, the gap between our positions proved in the end too large to bridge in the time available and it has been necessary to put both draft resolutions to the vote. Whilst regretting this, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 express the hope that, at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, it will indeed prove possible to draft a single text on the bilateral nuclear arms negotiations.

Mr. AMIGUES (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation is pleased to inform the Committee that, following intensive consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53, entitled "Tenth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research", we produced draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1, which is before the Committee for a decision.

The main changes in the revised draft relate to operative paragraph 7, concerning the study which the General Assembly would ask the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) to prepare, and also to paragraph 4, on the way in which the study would be financed. The solution found in the revised

(Mr. Amigues, France)

draft has been the subject of consultations with all delegations involved and has been accepted by them.

As the Committee is aware, UNIDIR has, since its founding, had satisfactory support from the United Nations and a proper balance has been maintained between financing the Institute through voluntary contributions and through grants from the regular budget. The latter is necessary to ensure the independence of the Institute and is also in keeping with its statute, as noted in the draft resolution.

In asking UNIDIR to study the economic aspect of disarmament - which would be financed equally from the regular budget and from voluntary contributions - the General Assembly would be acting in accordance with the spirit of UNIDIR. Studies carried out by UNIDIR complement the studies carried out the Department for Disarmament Affairs, and by reason of their exploratory character they relate mainly to new issues.

My delegation would like to emphasize that the States sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.53/Rev.1 would be pleased if the draft resolution could gain consensus and general support for UNIDIR. We trust that Member States will confirm their support by agreeing to a consensus on the draft resolution and also by making voluntary contributions permitting the partial financing of the study in question.

Mr. SUTRESNA (Indonesia): In my capacity as current Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

As representatives may note, operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution reflect the outcome of the 1990 substantive session of the Commission held in May 1990, the results of which have been widely commended.

In paragraph 8, the General Assembly would endorse the set of measures of the reform programme adopted by the Disarmament Commission. Paragraph 10 relates to the question of substantive agenda items for the 1991 session. As members of the

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

Committee may recall, the Commission had conducted extensive consultations over the past few months on that issue with delegations and held six open-ended meetings with a view to reaching agreement on a set of agenda items for the 1991 session of the Commission.

At the consultation meeting of the Commission, held on 15 November, consensus was reached on a set of agenda items for the 1991 session, which are as follows:

- "(1) Objective information on military matters;
- "(2) Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons;
- "(3) Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security;
- "(4) The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields."

The agreed agenda items are now reflected in paragraph 10 of revised draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1. In this connection, I should like to express my gratitude to all delegations for their co-operation and for the spirit of compromise which enabled the Commission to reach consensus, on a set of agenda items for its 1991 session.

On behalf of the sponsors and of the Disarmament Commission, I request that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.12/Rev.1 be adopted by consensus.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia): We regret that, despite intensive negotiations, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 are not in a position to accept the proposed compromise and agree on a single text on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

By merging the two drafts the non-aligned countries, on whose behalf I am speaking, went quite far in an effort to meet the concerns of other States. We even expressed a readiness to introduce some more important changes in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5, in the hope that the changes that are taking place in international relations and the positive international climate would enable us, this year, to agree on a single text on such an important issue.

Unfortunately, despite all efforts - and I should like to express our thanks and appreciation to all participants in the negotiations, particularly the delegation of the United Kingdom - the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C.1/45/L.35 were not able to reach agreement. Therefore, as happened last year, my delegation will be obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35.

Finally, I wish to repeat something that I said when I was introducing draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5: that, in our view, the international community ought to have a joint position in respect of an issue as important as bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. We sincerely hope - as, we are pleased to have heard, do the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 - that next year we shall be in a position to have such a text.

The CHAIRMAN: As no representative wants to speak in explanation of vote, or otherwise, in respect of draft resolutions in cluster 5, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5, entitled "General and complete disarmament" and has the subtitle "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

(The Chairman)

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 are as follows: Yugoslavia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries, and Panama.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35, entitled "General and complete disarmament" and has the subtitle "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 16 November 1990.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 are as follows: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

* Subsequently the delegation of Uruguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.35 was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 55 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of Hungary, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): The Hungarian delegation had sincerely hoped that separate votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.5 and A/C.1/45/L.35 would not take place and that this explanation would not be required. As a sponsor of one of these two draft resolutions on the same subject, my delegation believes that bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations are so important that only one draft resolution should have been submitted, and consequently, put to the vote in the General Assembly. That would have been more to the point.

We are aware of the efforts made to that effect by various delegations and therefore regret even more that again this year full success could not be achieved.

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.5 in spite of its shortcomings. This affirmative vote, however, is due much more to the subject-matter - that is, the negotiations and their progress - than to the wording of the draft resolution. We can only urge the authors of both drafts to take a few more steps next year in order to succeed in finding common ground for a single draft resolution on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B and A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, listed in cluster 7.

I shall call on those representatives wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. KAPAMBWE (Zambia): Since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken, allow me to join all those who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Sir, and your colleagues in the Bureau on being elected to your respective positions. My delegation wishes to place on record its great satisfaction at the way you have conducted the work of the Committee so far. We are confident that the rest of your tenure will be just as distinguished.

(Mr. Kapambwe, Zambia)

We are meeting today to take action on a draft resolution that is of great importance to my country, Zambia, and the countries in the region of southern Africa, and, indeed, to all the countries on the continent of Africa. I am here referring to the two parts of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled, respectively, "Implementation of the Declaration" on the denuclearization of Africa, and "Nuclear capability of South Africa", which were introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone on 6 November 1990 on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

I have always known the African delegations to be active participants in the work of the Committee. This year has been no different. Even on those agenda items that relate to regions other than their own, African delegations have participated with equal zeal, often helping to promote understanding where misunderstanding threatens to pit countries of other regions against one another.

While the African countries have always been guided by the principle that all the issues discussed in the Committee are of concern to all mankind, they have always been willing to respect and support the regional initiatives of other countries. It is against this background that my delegation harbours the hope that the two parts of the draft resolution I referred to earlier will receive wide support among the members of the Committee.

It is with some sadness and concern that my delegation has noticed a trend in this Committee and in other committees towards restoring South Africa's bona fides by dropping any criticism of apartheid in our resolutions. It is not lack of seriousness on our part to insist on retaining our criticism of apartheid. Indeed we would very much wish to see our draft resolutions adopted by consensus. But consensus should not be an end in itself.

(Mr. Kapambwe, Zambia)

Unless there is some information which we are not aware of, apartheid is still the official policy of the Government of South Africa. True, a number of measures have been taken by the South African Government - and we welcome that. However, these measures have only corrected aberrations which were created by the South African Government itself and which ought never to have been created in the first instance.

Our criticism of South Africa has never been intended to be permanent. We are prepared to welcome South Africa to the community of nations the moment it abolishes apartheid and reaches a negotiated settlement with its majority population on the running of the country. This moment has however not arrived and it would be premature for the United Nations to relax its pressure on the South African régime at this critical hour. It is important to ask the questions: Why do we wish to drop criticism of apartheid now? Has the South African Government indicated that it will abolish apartheid when the United Nations relaxes the pressure? What exactly are we going to achieve by so doing?

If we have to err, let us do so on the side of caution. The experience that our countries in southern Africa have had in dealing with successive South African régimes has left us with some scepticism about the seriousness with which these régimes take their own public pronouncements.

It is not easy for us in the region to feel sufficiently assured by the few measures taken by the South African Government when 1.5 million of our people have died in less than a decade from causes related to South Africa's aggression and acts of destabilization, when our economies have lost \$62 billion over the same period owing to the same causes.

Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe): The delegation of Zimbabwe has taken note of the Secretary-General's report on South Africa's nuclear capability. We are also aware

(Mr. Davairo, Zimbabwe)

of current developments on the South African political landscape and hope that these may result in the birth of a truly democratic and non-racial South Africa.

The implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa remains a cherished goal for Zimbabwe. There is no doubt that the greatest obstacle to that implementation remains the nuclear capability of South Africa and the continuing threat to regional and international peace and security that it poses. We are greatly concerned that the nuclear capability of South Africa, with all it represents, has been nurtured and developed with the assistance of the very countries whose stated aim is to promote peaceful coexistence and mutual security not only in the southern African region but also in the world. Such assistance is glaringly contradictory.

We are aware of the denials of the South African Government that its nuclear programme has any sinister intent. We are also aware of its recent halfhearted offer to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty. It is our belief that if South Africa was sincere in its intentions, it would not seek to make its accession to the non-proliferation Treaty conditional on the accession of any other country in the region, in view of the fact that none of the other countries in the region have even the most rudimentary of nuclear programmes. Further, none of them has ever been as aggressive and destabilizing as South Africa in respect of its neighbours.

Zimbabwe's accession to the non-proliferation Treaty will be a sovereign act. It will not be based on the actions or lack of actions of any other State in the region or elsewhere.

Finally, we in the southern African region remain aware of the grave threat that the South African régime poses not only to ourselves, its immediate neighbours, but to all who believe in peace. While apartheid makes this threat even graver, given that apartheid leaders are on record as saying that in defence

(Mr. Dzvairo, Zimbabwe)

of their system no rules will apply, the nuclear capability of South Africa will continue to be of concern to us in our quest for the denuclearization of Africa. Our delegation therefore urges all members to support both part A and part B of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39.

Mrs. MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation wishes to associate itself fully with the statements of the representatives of Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, we wish to emphasize again that we find it ironic that the racist régime suggests in document A/C.1/45/9 that there should be an equal commitment by the other States of the southern African region to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Our commitment has been expressed since 1964, with the adoption of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, with regard to whose implementation a draft resolution, A/C.1/45/L.39 A, is before the Committee. That Declaration has been frustrated by the very racist régime that is talking of an equal commitment.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I should like to make a brief comment on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

My delegation wishes to concentrate its intervention on the Secretary-General's report (A/45/571) of 29 October this year on South Africa's nuclear-tipped ballistic missile capability, submitted in accordance with paragraph 5 of resolution 44/113 B of 15 December 1989.

First, my delegation wishes to thank the Secretary-General for his prompt action on the request made on this issue last year. We also commend the experts for their excellent job. With the able assistance of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, they produced the report within the record time of five months.

In my delegation's view, the report is well balanced, within the scope of the resources available for its production and the opportunities to investigate a development that has been shrouded in utter secrecy by the principal culprit. It is balanced in the sense that it did not reach conclusions on the basis of evidence that could not be verified. However, there is strong evidence that South Africa's nuclear capability has only been further confirmed by the acquisition of a long-range rocket and its test-firing some 1,400 kilometres into the South Atlantic

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

on 5 July 1989. If South Africa has no sinister intentions in its ballistic missile programme, why did it wait to announce this until it was confronted with that evidence?

With regard to collaboration, my delegation is worried by the similarity between the Israeli site used to launch the Shavit space vehicle and South Africa's Overberg test site. In this regard, my delegation therefore wishes to stress the implications for the continent of Africa of South Africa's acquisition of a long-range missile.

First, acquisition of the missile is a threat to regional peace and security. Secondly, the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction at this time, when the world is being made to believe that the political atmosphere in South Africa is improving, will only make the purported intention to eliminate apartheid through current reforms look cosmetic. Thirdly, South Africa's continual abuse of, and flagrant disregard for the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa can only worsen even further the already charged atmosphere in the region. The continued violation of the principles underlying the General Assembly Declaration of the Zone of Peace and Co-operation of the South Atlantic will surely endanger international peace and security. Indeed, the sea lanes of the South Atlantic and the desire of the African and Latin American States to safeguard peaceful maritime activities and freedom of navigation on the high seas will be jeopardized.

In the light of the imminent danger posed by South Africa's current participation in an arms race, at a time when most regions of the world are de-escalating the arms race, my delegation must strongly condemn South Africa's nuclear-weapons programme and its delivery system. We wish to call for further investigation of South Africa's acquisition of these weapons of mass destruction. Further investigation should attempt to conduct intelligence activities with regard to the parties involved, especially the collaborators.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

Finally, my delegation wishes to remind these collaborators that they will be individually and collectively held responsible for facilitating the acquisition of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems by the crisis-prone and bankrupt régime in South Africa. My Government will make its views on this question known in greater detail at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): All who have commented have agreed that there can be no progress in any disarmament process if there is not at least a minimum basis of confidence between the various parties. This draft resolution - A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 - in spite of some cosmetic changes, does not contribute anything at all as a confidence-building measure; quite the opposite. It has become a pernicious ritual, which should be discontinued if Israel is to have any faith in the workings of the United Nations. It is completely at variance with the basic tenor and the recommendations put before the First Committee by the Secretary-General in his thoughtful study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (A/45/435).

Three developments relevant to the background of the situation in the Middle East have become apparent recently. First, the crisis in the Gulf has emphasized the seriousness of the Iraqi threats to use weapons of mass destruction against Israel; secondly, there have been ample published indications about Iraq's intention to acquire nuclear weapons and its actions in that regard despite its obligations as a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); and thirdly, the Secretary-General, in his study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone, which is before this Committee, stressed the need for such a zone in the Middle East. According to this report, a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be even more effective than the NPT under the conditions prevailing in the Middle East.

We are convinced that a nuclear-weapon-free zone is the only possible practical solution. This was evident in our statement on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.1 at the 30th meeting, on 7 November this year, and in our joining of the consensus on that draft resolution earlier in this session. Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 is unfortunately the complete anti-thesis of draft resolution

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

A/C.1/45/L.1 and cannot contribute anything to the attainment of peace and disarmament in the Middle East.

I have some brief comments to make on some of the operative paragraphs.

Operative paragraph 1 refers to the refusal to renounce any possession of nuclear weapons. No State has ever made a blanket statement of this kind - not even signatories to the non-proliferation Treaty, which can opt out of the Treaty.

Operative paragraph 2 refers to nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa. As we have stated on many occasions, there is no nuclear co-operation between Israel and South Africa.

Operative paragraph 4 demands that Israel place all its facilities under safeguards. Israel has repeatedly stated and explained its non-proliferation policy: it is by way of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, based on precedence and on recommendations of the Palme Commission. Once we have such a zone, full-scope safeguards will of course be part of it, made credible by mutual reassurances. There is no basis for singling Israel out among all the other States that have not signed the NPT or accepted full-scope safeguards, for example, Pakistan and India. With regard to attacking or threatening to attack nuclear facilities, we made it very clear, as recently as yesterday, that the policy of the Israeli Government was that "nuclear facilities dedicated to peaceful ends should be inviolable" and that it would not "attack or threaten to attack any peaceful nuclear facilities".

(A/C.1/45/PV.37, p. 13)

In operative paragraph 7 the Secretary-General is called upon to continue to report to the General Assembly and in paragraph 8 there is a decision to include the item in the provisional agenda of the next session, even if there is nothing to report. This is only to make sure that the First Committee does not forget to discuss Israel in perpetuity.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

The absurdity of this request is evident from the report of the Secretary-General in document A/45/574, where the only subject was the resolution adopted by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in September of this year, which in content was almost identical with the Organization's resolution of last year.

The First Committee has to decide whether the majority of its members wish to espouse the single-minded and unwarranted harassment of Israel in the face of the situation in the Middle East now manifest to everyone and the unbridled and unconditional threats against the very existence of Israel on the part of Iraq, Syria, Libya and Iran.

In his study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East the Secretary-General states:

"... Israeli opinion must gain confidence that its neighbours have no intention of using their superior manpower, wealth and other resources to destroy Israel ..." (A/45/435, para. 152)

If Israel is to be reassured that a measure of equitableness reigns in the international community, the First Committee is invited to stop the victimization of Israel and to vote against the draft resolution in its entirety.

Mr. STAYKOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

Bulgaria has been striving consistently over the years for the implementation of the principle of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as one of the main pillars of world security. In conformity with this stand, we are resolutely against an increase in the number of new States with nuclear weapon capabilities in any region of the world, including the Middle East.

(Mr. Staykov, Bulgaria)

At the same time, we are alarmed over the growing possibility of nuclear-weapon capabilities being acquired by States that have not so far been addressed in the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations bodies. In the light of this fact, we find it difficult to accept some of the language contained in the draft resolution in question, since my delegation believes it runs counter to the spirit of accommodation now prevailing in the world Organization, which seeks points of mutual interest, inter alia, in security matters.

It is our assessment that in the present situation of unrest and deep crisis in the Middle East region, including the use of military force, the draft resolution would not serve the cause of understanding and durable peace. Accordingly, the Bulgarian delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990. The programme budget implications of this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/45/L.58.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A is Sierra Leone, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A. A recorded vote has been requested, including a separate recorded vote on the eighth paragraph of the preamble.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A was retained by 109 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: France, Israel, Liechtenstein, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A as a whole was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on part B of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sierra Leone, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1990. There is an oral statement in connection with this draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

* Subsequently the delegation of the Netherlands advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 is Sierra Leone, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General in respect of part B of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

"By the terms of operative paragraph 11, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance that the Organization of African Unity may seek regarding the modalities and elements for the preparation and implementation of the relevant convention or treaty on the denuclearisation of Africa. In carrying out this task, the Secretary-General would provide all assistance practicable within existing resources, and therefore there would be no additional programme-budget implications for the biennium 1990 to 1991.

"By the terms of operative paragraph 15, the General Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session on the military assistance that apartheid South Africa is receiving from Israel and any other sources in advanced missile technology as well as the supporting technical facilities. In carrying out this task, the Secretary-General would report on any further relevant developments that may occur before the forty-sixth session beyond those already described in the Secretary-General's report contained in document A/45/571. It is at present difficult to assess the work-load that might be involved, but it is anticipated that there would be no additional programme-budget implications for the biennium 1990 to 1991."

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B was adopted by 98 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Lebanon at an earlier meeting of the First Committee on behalf of the Arab States.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 are the following: Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): I have asked to speak to explain the vote of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and my own country, Norway, on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/45/L.39, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa".

The position of the Nordic countries on the question of apartheid is clear and well known. Apartheid remains a flagrant violation of fundamental human rights and freedoms, as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in international law. To all of us, apartheid implies an intolerable violation of human dignity.

The Nordic countries share the concern voiced in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would be a major set-back to international efforts at non-proliferation. The Nordic countries have therefore persistently and in various contexts called upon the South African Government to adhere forthwith to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), most recently before this year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. Adherence by South Africa would contribute to regional stability and have significant benefits for the

* Subsequently the delegation of Uruguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

non-proliferation régime on a global level as well. South Africa's declared intention to adhere to the NPT should materialize as soon as possible. In this context the Nordic countries welcome the recent adherence of Mozambique to the NPT. We call on other front-line States to do the same as soon as possible.

For the aforementioned reasons, our delegations voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A. We were, however, compelled to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B because of problems with a number of aspects of the text before us.

The world has lately witnessed important improvements in the international political climate. This applies to various regions, including southern Africa, as exemplified by Namibia's accession to independence and by significant developments within South Africa itself. Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B does not take account of these developments and is becoming increasingly outdated.

We would also have found it natural if draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B had drawn upon the report of the Secretary-General on South Africa's nuclear-tipped ballistic missile capability (A/45/571) as well as the consensus report of the Disarmament Commission on its 1990 session.

As in previous years, the Nordic countries strongly deplore the continued arbitrary and inappropriate singling out of individual countries or groups of countries. This clearly detracts from the main objective of strengthening international support for the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. It also makes it more difficult to reach an international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

In addition, we must in general reserve our position with regard to formulations which fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as laid down in the

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

Charter. Furthermore, the Assembly should address itself to Governments and not to private citizens and enterprises.

The Nordic countries sincerely hope that in the future the Committee will be presented with texts that make it possible to deal with this important issue in a more credible manner.

Mr. JANDL (Austria) (interpretation from French): Austria abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

The Austrian delegation shares the concern expressed with regard to international peace and security and the dangerous situation that could be brought about by nuclear proliferation, particularly in the region in question. Austria is against nuclear proliferation at the global and regional levels.

This being said, my delegation is, nevertheless, of the view that draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B no longer reflects the realities of the region in question in that the situation has changed very much in the course of the last year. In addition, Austria cannot agree with the idea of naming a country or group of countries in this way in a General Assembly resolution. Taking into account these reservations, my delegation was obliged to abstain.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): I wish to explain why Ireland felt obliged to abstain this year, for the first time ever, on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa. Ireland has consistently supported the fundamental principle of the denuclearization of Africa. We have indicated our continuing support for that principle by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We recognize that the two texts include many of the same elements and sentiments. However, draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A expresses them in a manner which we can support.

In relation to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on South Africa's nuclear capability, Ireland shares the concern expressed in the draft resolution on South Africa's unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. We attach the greatest importance to the maintenance of an effective international nuclear non-proliferation régime through accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and through the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on as universal a basis as possible.

That said, we have reservations on a number of elements in the draft resolution, more specifically:

First, we have reservations about the selective focus in a text on this issue on matters which, while not immediately germane to the text, are of such importance to the international community as a whole that they deserve to receive - and are receiving - comprehensive treatment elsewhere in the United Nations. Thus, Ireland's principled and consistent opposition to, and abhorrence of, apartheid are well known. We have also welcomed the progress which has been made through dialogue in South Africa in the past year, as well as in its relations with neighbouring countries. We readily acknowledge, however, that such progress, which constitutes only a beginning, has not been matched by concrete positive

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

developments in placing South Africa's nuclear facilities under the system of international safeguards.

Secondly, we have reservations about the singling out of certain countries or groups of countries. We fear that such action might adversely affect the achievement of the important objective of strengthening international support for the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

Ireland considers that the issue of the nuclear capability of South Africa is one of utmost concern to the international community and is, moreover, an issue on which consensus is desirable and could be achieved. In that context, we would draw attention to the fact that a major achievement of the 1990 session of the Disarmament Commission was the adoption, by consensus, of conclusions and recommendations on the nuclear capability of South Africa. The attainment of consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B would have been facilitated if it more closely reflected the recommendations agreed by the Disarmament Commission. My delegation hopes that this will be the case when the resolution is next presented, thus enabling us to register a positive vote on this important issue.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, though we cannot subscribe to the purport of its eighth preambular paragraph. On the other hand, our delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, concerning the nuclear capability of South Africa. The Netherlands has some doubt that the line of action set forth in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B would be to the advantage of our ultimate goal which is to induce South Africa to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B does not take into account some positive developments such as the recent statements by Minister "Pik" Botha in which the

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

South African Government announced its preparedness to start negotiations with the International Atomic Energy Agency on a full-scope safeguards agreement. The closure of the enrichment facility in Valindaba is another indication of South African intentions to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by South Africa, together with the other States of the region, would be a significant contribution to the process of the denuclearization of Africa, a concept my Government fully supports. In this context the Netherlands welcomes the decision of Mozambique to join the non-proliferation Treaty.

Those considerations are not fully covered in draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, which, inter alia, in addition to other objections of a more political nature, as well as the lack of reference to the encouraging political developments in South Africa, prompted us to abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. ARBELL (Israel): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/45/39 B, my delegation was unfortunately unable to vote for the draft resolution because of the unfair naming of Israel in the preambular part.

We have on many occasions, both in this Organization and in other forums, made known our abhorrence and total condemnation of apartheid, and we have curtailed our relations with South Africa. As far as alleged nuclear collaboration is concerned, my Government has often categorically rejected that allegation.

In 1989, the then Minister of Defence, Mr. Yitshak Rabin, stated, in an interview on Israel Radio:

"When it comes to the nuclear field, we have no relations whatsoever with South Africa, and therefore all the stories about any relationship between our two countries on this issue are totally unbiased and without any justification."

Mr. ADANK (New Zealand): After careful consideration, New Zealand abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa". However, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that New Zealand continues to reject totally South Africa's policy of apartheid. New Zealand also remains deeply concerned regarding reports of the acquisition by States of nuclear weapons capabilities and technologies. For this reason, New Zealand has urged all States which have not yet done so, including South Africa, to adhere to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards at their nuclear facilities.

New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution L.39 A. However, with regard to draft resolution L.39 B, New Zealand believes it is important to distinguish concerns about apartheid on the one hand and nuclear proliferation on the other. In the latter respect, we are pleased to note the balanced report on South Africa's nuclear-tipped missile capability recently prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of three qualified experts, and would have liked to have seen greater recognition of its findings in the text of the present draft resolution. In particular we believe it is important, as the Secretary-General notes, to take into account development under way in South Africa, which could be having an important effect on that country's nuclear and military policies.

We hope that such developments will be taken into account when this draft resolution is next brought before the Committee.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 A and B, which have just been adopted.

The United Kingdom fully supports South Africa's neighbours in their efforts to guarantee and safeguard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. It is in the interest of all, especially that of the population of South Africa and its neighbours, that there should be no nuclear weapons in the region. We note the statement by the South African Government on 17 September that South Africa is prepared to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the context of an equal commitment by other States in the region. We welcome the South African Government's stated willingness to commence talks with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on concluding a comprehensive safeguards agreement on its nuclear facilities.

In the interest of regional and world security, there is an urgent need for South Africa to accede to the Treaty and to place all nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. We hope that South Africa will take these steps at a very early date.

As we have stated on many occasions, the United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme. Together with the other Member States of the European Community we have prohibited all nuclear collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear sector. There is absolutely no question of our providing the South African Government with assistance in the development of a nuclear weapons capability. That would be a gross violation of our obligations under the non-proliferation Treaty.

As a founder member of the missile technology control régime, the United Kingdom is concerned about recent reports that South Africa and Israel may be collaborating on missile development. We are therefore in sympathy with important

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

aspects of the two resolutions. However, there are passages we find less acceptable. All States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a right that is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments. We also note that these resolutions contain judgements which are either insufficiently substantiated or are more properly matters for the Security Council.

In addition to these points, which we have made repeatedly over the years, we note the financial implications of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A.

For all these reasons, we abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A and voted against draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): The United States would like to make a comment with regard to its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The United States noted with satisfaction the consensus reached in the Disarmament Commission last spring on the text regarding the nuclear capabilities of South Africa. That same spirit prevailed in the Declaration adopted at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly, on Apartheid, in December 1989, and in its resumed session last September. Accordingly, the United States is disappointed with the tone of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39. This draft resolution, which did not achieve consensus, undermines the steady progress we have been making. We believe that when the international community speaks with one voice it better emphasizes its abhorrence of apartheid and gives impetus to the ongoing negotiations towards a non-racial democracy.

Mr. SADER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B, on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

Despite the recent favourable developments in southern Africa, my delegation agrees with the central idea in the draft, that is, as indicated in the report of Working Group I of the Disarmament Commission, that the introduction of nuclear weapons on the African continent by South Africa would militate against the intention to keep that continent out of the arms race. Moreover, until there are assurances to the contrary, it constitutes a potential threat to its neighbours, given the peculiar characteristics of apartheid.

Nevertheless, we should have liked to have seen the content of the Secretary-General's report better reflected in this text. In particular, my delegation would like to express its reservations regarding the fourteenth and sixteenth paragraphs of the preamble and operative paragraph 4. In fact, we cannot fail to note that those paragraphs would, in our view, constitute a return to the practice of singling out countries or groups of countries in language that would not be conducive to the achievement of a constructive dialogue.

Mr. GAJDA (Hungary): This year the Hungarian delegation abstained on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A and on the whole of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 B in order to express our dissatisfaction with a particular routine in the Committee, and also to indicate our dislike of certain honoured patterns and practices.

My delegation believes that the United Nations General Assembly as a whole and the First Committee in particular should not continue year after year citing unverified reports and unverifiable allegations. We believe that an end should be put to the inappropriate practice of singling out individual countries,

(Mr. Gadjia, Hungary)

particularly if the international community is really interested in bringing about positive developments in those countries or in their attitudes concerning the important subject under consideration.

We also believe that resolutions of the General Assembly must not ignore the significant evolution and the favourable trends which, after such a long time, are reported from the area.

With those considerations in mind, the Hungarian delegation could not continue to support the draft resolution.

In explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, the Hungarian delegation wishes to state that its abstention in no way reflects Hungary's position concerning nuclear armaments or the proliferation of nuclear arms. My country's position is clear in this regard, and nobody can question its record. Hungary has always condemned any acts of proliferation and any attempts at acquiring nuclear weapon capabilities. We have done so and will continue to do so irrespective of the geographical location, political system or ideological creed of the country in question. However, the Hungarian delegation no longer supports any modalities which, in its considered view, cannot serve the proclaimed purposes.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): The Italian delegation, on behalf of the European Community and its member States, wishes to explain the vote of the Twelve on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, on Israeli nuclear armament.

While acknowledging that some efforts have been made by the sponsors of the draft resolution to improve it, the Twelve have maintained their abstention on it as it still makes a number of assumptions that they do not necessarily share, inter alia in the sixth preambular paragraph, which recalls a resolution of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) against which the Twelve voted. Furthermore, other paragraphs of the draft resolution do not take into account some declarations of the Israeli Government recently reaffirmed in the First Committee.

The Twelve strongly support and are fully committed to the objective of nuclear non-proliferation. The Twelve recognize the indispensable role played by the IAEA and its safeguards in the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They recognize that these safeguards are the corner-stone of an effective non-proliferation régime. For their part, the Twelve have accepted, in accordance with their respective individual status, the exercise of international controls on their nuclear installations and apply constraints to their export policies. The Twelve strongly support the application of safeguards on as universal a basis as possible. However, the Twelve cannot support calls on only one of the States that have not done so to place its facilities under IAEA safeguards.

Mrs. LETTS (Australia): Despite the considerable improvements the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1 have made to the text, my delegation still has a number of reservations on this draft resolution, just adopted, on Israeli nuclear armament.

But Australia's abstention should not be interpreted as less than full and strong support for calls on Israel to join the non-proliferation Treaty and to accept full-scope safeguards on all its nuclear activities. Australia has

(Mrs. Letts, Australia)

consistently enjoined Israel and other States not party to the non-proliferation Treaty, particularly those that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to take such action.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): In connection with draft resolutions A/C.1/45/L.39 and A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, which have just been adopted and on both of which Japan abstained, my delegation wishes to state the following for the record.

Japan, as a strong supporter of the non-proliferation Treaty régime, is very much concerned over the persistent stories about possible Israeli and South African nuclear armament. Japan earnestly hopes that Israel, South Africa and other countries that are not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty will accede to the Treaty as soon as possible and further strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime, thus removing the concerns of the international community.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation voted in favour of the eighth paragraph of the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.39 A. It also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, despite our well-known position that no State has an obligation to submit its nuclear facilities to the IAEA safeguards. It did so because of the importance of the political objectives sought by these draft resolutions, which, by their very nature, far exceed essentially technical aspects.

Similarly, we believe it appropriate to emphasize that the reference to delivery vehicles contained in the operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.45/Rev.1, in our view, deserves more careful consideration. We suggest that it would be advisable in future to refrain from associating this question with the production of nuclear weapons.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.